

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Addrass: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRACEMARKS Washington, O.C. 20231

FILING DATE SERIAL NUMBER 7913Z HUFFMAN 09/10/90 07/580,246 T. KALINCHAK, S SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER WELLINET TUPER - 5 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA GARDEN CITY, NY 11530 113 TATE MAILED: 08/12/91 This is a communication from the existing on charge of your addition of COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEAMARKS This action is made final. ☐ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on_ month(s), Thirty days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for response to this ection is set to axpire _____ Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Pert I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 2. Notice re Petent Orawing, PTO-948. 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 5. Information on How to Effect Orawing Changes, PTO-1474. SUMMARY OF ACTION ere pending in the application. 1. Claims are withdrawn from consideration. have bean cancelled. 2. Claims_ 3. Claims 5. Claims ___ are subject to restriction or election requirement. 6. Claims 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for axamination purposes. - 8. - Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 thase drawings 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _ are acceptable; not ecceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Orawing, PTO-948). ____. has (have) been 🔲 approved by tha 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on ______ axaminer; disapproved by the axaminer (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _ 12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been raceivad __ ; filed on _ been filed in parent application, serial no. 13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance axcept for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayla, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

Serial No. 580,246
Art Unit 113

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 1-13, drawn to processes of producing and extracting C60/C70, classified in Class 423, subclass 658.5.
- II. Claims 14-36, drawn to C60/C70 products, classified in Class 423, subclass 445.

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process such as the flame combustion of hydrocarbon-oxygen mixtures.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications and recognized divergent subject matter matter, and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Serial No. 580,246

Art Unit 113

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

A telephone call was made to Attorney William E. McNulty on July 30, 1991 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

561(

S. Kalinchak:aw August 06, 1991 Michael Lewis

Supervisory Patent Examiner Patent Examining Group 110